

REMARKS

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11 are now present in this application. Claims 3, 6 and 7 are independent.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8 and 9 have been canceled and claims 3, 4, 6 and 7 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references supplied with the Information Disclosure Statements filed August 16, 2006 and July 9, 2008, and for providing Applicants with initialed copies of the PTO-SB08 forms filed therewith.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Honda et al. (US 4,764,158). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 8 have been cancelled, thus rendering this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al. in view of Plaxton (US 3,706,604). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 3 has been amended to recite a combination of elements in a power transmission chain including a plurality of link plates individually including through-holes, having their side surfaces covered by a coating material capable of being abraded or separated by using the chain, and arranged as mutually overlapped in a thicknesswise direction thereof and a plurality of pins inserted through the through-holes for flexibly interconnecting the plural link plates and a coating on the plurality of link plates, the coating having a lubrication component.

Applicants respectfully submit that this combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 3 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Honda et al. and Plaxton.

In the rejection, the Examiner relied upon Plaxton for disclosing a coating on metallic surfaces, such as zinc. The Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to use a coating, such as disclosed by Plaxton with the transmission chain disclosed by Honda et al. The claim has been amended to recite that the coating has a lubrication component. Plaxton does not disclose such a lubrication component, as the coating is used for preventing staining or corrosion of the metal surfaces, or to provide a base for paint or similar protective coatings. The coating of Plaxton does not have a lubrication component, as is now claimed, which reduces contact pressure between the link plates and therefore increases power transmission efficiency.

Claims 6 and 7 have been amended in a similar manner to present method claims of varying scope. Applicants respectfully submit that the combinations of elements and steps as set forth in independent claims 3, 6 and 7 are not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Honda et al. and Plaxton, for the reasons explained above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims 4, 10 and 11, Applicants submit that these claims depend from independent claim 3, which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore are allowable. In addition, these claims recite further limitations which are not disclosed

or made obvious by the applied prior art references. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Chris McDonald, Registration No. 41,533, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: June 30, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Paul C. Lewis *eym*

Registration No.: 43,368

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants